UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,298	03/09/2004	Mark D. Elkovitch	134380-2	4441
23413 7590 05/10/2007 CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH			EXAMINER	
			THOMAS, JAISON P	
BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1751	
	·			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/797,298	ELKOVITCH, MARK D.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jaison P. Thomas	1751		

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>4/24/2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
AMENDMENTS  2. M. The assessed amendment(s) filed offer a final rejection, but arior to the data of filing a brief will not be entered because
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> </ol>
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) 🔀 They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).
13. Other:
LORNAM. DOUYON
LORNA M. DOUYON PRIMARY EXAMINED

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons stated in the Final Rejection dated 3/13//2007 and Non-Final Rejection dated on 10/11/2006. In the attached Remarks dated 4/24/2007, applicant traverses the 102(b) rejections of Claims 1-17,20-24 and 41 over Shibuta (WO 97/15935) stating Shibuta teaches nanosized electrically conductive oxides whereas Applicants claim nanosized electrically non-conductive oxides being used as the dispersion agents and Applicant cites specific passages from Shibuta supporting this position. The Examiner respectfully disagrees for reasons stated in the Non-Final and Final Rejections and further posits that the dispersion agents claimed as "electrically non-conducting" in Claim 1 raises issues of relative terminology which is not clarified by reference to the specification as to what constitutes a"non-conducting" material. In addition, Applicant's literal citations of Shibuta have not been found in the Shibuta (WO 97/15935) reference. Examiner notes that in the last sentence on pg. 7 of Remarks dated 4/24/2007 Applicant has cited Shibuta (WO 97/15934) which is a different reference from the reference cited in the Office Actions. Applicant further traverses the 103(a) rejections of Claim 4-8 and 11-14 over Shibuta in view of the Applied Nanotech Inc. (ANI) webpage arguing no motivation to modify the Shibuta reference with the teaches of the ANI webpage. The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the reasons cites in the previous Office Actions and further posits that the motivation of the ANI webpage is to illustrate what one of ordinary skill in the art would know about well-known morphological and physical properties of carbon nanotubes at the time the invention was made.